3/24/73

Dear Bud,

I write this without having finished reading today's paper on the chance I have to go into town and can mail it. There are two quotes from the Watergate stories that are relevant to our spectro suit and Sirica and are relevant to my previous FOI suits, all of them, for there was lying if not perjury in all, including by Kleindienst, and I think perjury in two, spectro and clothing/pix.

"A spokesman for the Justice Department said yesterday that is McCord's statement to Sirica 'contains information supporting these allegations (of perjury& and other criminal activity) or indicating any other violation of federal law, the Department of Justice will, of course, take appropriate action immediately.'"

In Peter Osnos' story on Sirica this quote from him: "Some good can and should come from a revelation of sinister conduct whenever and wherever such conduct exists."

Sirica now knows that the cases that should have been presented to him were not. There can be no question but that those who paid for the tapping alone committed a criminal offense and the present Justice administration recently obtained such an indictment. He may or may not know of or suspect other criminality. But he has had an education since he held our spectro hearing. He may or may not have put the interpretation I have on the court of appeals' footnote 5.

I charged perjury in the clothing/pix suit. I charged it to Mitchell and Kleindienst and to the judge and I think there is no doubt that with Rhoads' affidavit there is perjury and its subornation. I never got any response. The charges are made and are not answered and the statute can't have run. Sirica is chief judge. I can visualize some problems in writing him about the Williams affidavit because that case is on remand back to him, but with your permission I am not unwilling to do this. You have a long memo from me on that affidavit, written as soon as I saw it.

The Rhoads affidavit is not before him, the crime was committed in the court of which he is chief judge, and all the papers are part of the record. Jim has all of them if you do not. Material was whether or not I'd made a request. Under FOI almost nothing can be more material. Rhoads swore falsely and I provided the proof in a number of ways, including Archives' responses to the request.

Another alternative is for you (or me) to write Kleindienst quoting his spokesman and telling him that if he is sincere in this you are asking him to examine the Williams affidavit and ascertain for himself whether or not it is perjurious and whether or not there is a question of subornation.

Let us call some bluffs and at the same time be ready for a better record. This gives us a great and legitimate opportunity I think we should sieze upon immediately.

There is also the Jevons affidavit that is perjurious.

Then there is the affidavit in the Ray extradition suit by the DJ lawyer saying he had given me what he had not. That surely is perjurious and the summary judgement is the most unequivocal proof of it. We have letters of transmittal of later date proving he swore falsely, too. Eardley wrote you such a letter and Paul Valentine, when last we discussed this, remember that he was with us and that this lawyer not only didn't give me what he said he had but refused my request. I do not know if Paul still recalls this. You may remember he was with us and gave us a ride back to your office.

This is off the top of my head. There may be more. We have, I think, a perfect context and a perfect situation. This is a rare opportunity to nail these sanctimonious liars who have a unique record of never failing to lie in any of my suits. It should also have salutary effect on all FOI matters in court and out if it is publicized. (This I will not attempt without consulting you.) If publicized now, it should make the task of the court of appeals much easier. And wouldn't it be something if a judge finally decided to do something about this endless perjury and impositions upon the courts?

Sincerely,